

City of Springfield
Work Session Meeting

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL WORK SESSION MEETING OF
THE SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL HELD
THURSDAY, JANUARY 26, 2006

The City of Springfield Council met in a special work session in the Library Meeting Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Thursday, January 26, 2006 at 12:18 p.m., with Council President John Woodrow presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Councilors Ballew, Lundberg, Fitch, Ralston, Woodrow, and Pishioneri. Also present were Interim City Manager Cynthia Pappas, City Attorney Joe Leahy, City Recorder Amy Sowa and members of the staff.

Mayor Leiken was absent (excused).

1. Justice Center Site Design Options – P50434.

Councilor Woodrow reminded Council that there were a lot of members of the church in the downtown and a lot of emotions tied to the church. As Council looked at the options presented, Council needed to keep in mind that although the drawings indicated public parking on certain options, that parking was still in the possession of the church and the Carter building and was not public parking. He said the architects were aware of that.

Councilor Woodrow also noted that the public meeting scheduled for February 6 would be moved to February 21 to allow time to invite all members of the Washburne Neighborhood to provide public input. Staff would also provide traffic counts for 4th and B Streets during the February 21 meeting.

Project Manager Carole Knapel presented the staff report on this item. On November 28, 2005, the Council approved an Agreement with Robertson Sherwood for the design of the Justice Center facility. The contract requires the architect to develop four site design concepts to be considered by the City. At this Work Session, the four options will be presented.

When the City selected the architect for the Justice Center project, the selection criteria addressed the importance of this project and the impact that this facility would have in the downtown area. Because of this issue, the contract with Robertson Sherwood Architects required that four initial site design options be developed. The development of four options allows the City of Springfield to compare the site designs and select the one best suited to the City's vision and requirements.

To develop the options, the architects met with the User Groups (courts, police, city prosecutor staff), City technical staff, the Executive Team and the Community Advisory Committee. Initially the architects prepared and presented fourteen concepts and presented these to each of the groups in December. The review and discussion of these concepts resulted in the development of the options presented in Attachment A.

The development of each of the options in Attachment A includes an analysis of the benefits and challenges of each option. In addition, the cost of each site design option has been compared and the cost premiums have been identified.

These four options have been presented to the User Groups, the City technical staff, the Executive Team and the Community Advisory Committee. A Public Forum was also conducted on January 18 in order to obtain input from all interested community members. Notices for the forum were published in the paper. Another Public Forum would be held the first week in February. Invitations would be sent out to surrounding property owners for this forum. Staff would return to Council on February 21 with the input from all groups and forums and seek direction from Council on which design they would choose.

Ms. Knapel thanked Council for taking time from their busy schedules to attend this special meeting. She acknowledged the architects who would be giving the presentation. She introduced Carl Sherwood from the Architectural Firm, Robertson Sherwood Architects.

Mr. Sherwood gave a summary of the process. He said additional information had been included to address questions received last week.

Buddy Golson, Rosser International Architects started the power point presentation and discussed the four options. He said the options were not rated in any way. These were not architectural designs, but site diagrams used to analyze how this project could fit on the site, how the parking could work and how the buildings could work. The next phase would include an architectural design, including floor plans. Mr. Golson described the location and design of each option. He discussed the pros and cons of each option as noted in Attachment A included in the Agenda Packet and displayed on the power point presentation.

Mr. Golson said there was interest by some to look back at some of the original fourteen options that included stacking the Jail and the Courts. He said if the building was stacked, there would be more land for parking and it would improve the movement of inmates to the Court. He discussed some of the issues with building a jail above office space, including possible intentional flooding by the inmates in their jail cells. He also noted that if the jail was not originally built and it was later added on top of the Police and Courts, it would be very disruptive and cost more. He discussed the option of building the jail under the Police and Courts. Someone had asked if only the shell of the jail could be built below and finished later. He noted the difficulties in doing that because of the complexity of the construction of the jail. He said the shell would need to be almost complete because of the many small components of the jail. He discussed issues with foundational structures built for a second story.

In summary, Mr. Golson said the stacked approach was an option, but the problems were greater than with the other options. He said they had asked the Contract Manager (CM) partners to look at the costing for both stacking options.

Mr. Sherwood introduced Frank Shepard, Project Manager for Heery International, heading up the Heery/Hyland team who would be discussing the comparative cost analysis.

Mr. Shepard said they had been tasked with cost estimating on the different options. He said Option 2 had been used for the baseline because it had the fewest impacts regarding costs, although it did relocate the Police. He referred to the power point presentation which showed the

Comparative Cost Analysis for each option. This information was also included in Attachment in the agenda packet. He discussed the Comparative Cost Analysis and explained the differences in each option. He said the figures did not include the cost for land acquired because they were not yet sure of those costs. He said the stacking option would cost an additional \$1,300,000 with a parking deck.

Ms. Knapel noted that Councilor Ballew had asked a specific question regarding a parking deck and any of the options could include a parking deck. The cost of building a parking deck that would hold approximately 100 cars would be \$1,100,000.

Councilor Fitch asked if that was a total of 100 cars or 100 on each deck.

Mr. Shepard said it would be 100 on each deck.

Councilor Ballew asked if she could have side by side comparisons of the costs of the Facility.

Ms. Knapel said she had intended to provide Council with that information in an upcoming Communication Packet. That would also include information on the stacked options and the parking deck costs.

Ms. Pappas asked if Councilor Ballew was asking for total costs of each option on one sheet. Yes.

Councilor Fitch asked what the amount was on Option 2 as the baseline.

Ms. Knapel said the cost estimating that had been done so far came out of the Program document in which Liebert and Associates gave an estimate per square foot. She said the costing that was done at that time was based on those numbers from past experience of typical construction costs for like construction. She said the cost of Option 2 fit most closely with the Program document and were in line with the budgeted amount from the bond measure.

Councilor Fitch asked if Option 2 could be built within the budget from the bond measure that was passed.

Ms. Knapel said that was the assumption.

Councilor Fitch asked if the facility could be built with additional funds left over, or if anything extra added would put them over budget.

Ms. Knapel said Option 2 would fit into the budget, and any of the other options would require additional funding or taking away of elements of the Program to fit within the budget. She said Option 2 was the best estimate of what could be built within the bond measure.

Discussion was held regarding the additional cost of the other options and how they could be reduced to fit within the budget.

Councilor Fitch asked what the range included.

Ms. Knapel said the next step, once the design selection was made, was to prepare a detailed analysis that would give the costs.

Councilor Fitch said it seemed that solid numbers needed to be known by Council before they could make a decision on the design option.

Mr. Sherwood said this was a site development exercise, to look at issues such as street closures and property acquisitions. He explained how the other options could be adjusted to fit within the budget. If adjustments were not made, additional funding would be needed.

Mr. Golson discussed parking issues with Option 2.

Ms. Knapel said the original budget from the bond measure did include money for leasing space from other property owners for parking.

Councilor Lundberg discussed the new contract with Liebert and the amount of money being spent on this project for design work, architects and CM/GC. She said for all the money spent at this point, she expected to see four options that fit within the budget. She said her assumption was that this project would not go outside the budget. She said the question for Council was whether or not they wanted to stay within the parameters of the bond measure budget. She said none of the options seemed to be within what the voters had approved.

Councilor Ralston said it was simple to him. Option 4 was not an option. Option 2 was the only option that would allow the Police to operate in their current location while the new Police Facility was being built. He said he didn't want anything that interfered with the existing church or Carter property.

Councilor Ballew said Option 2 was not viable because it would close B Street and reroute traffic into the Washburne Neighborhood, her neighborhood. She said a lot of money had been spent to improve and widen B Street and it was an excellent arterial street between 14th Street and Pioneer Parkway. She also noted that 4th Street was also a good north/south street, but she would be more willing to close 4th than B Street.

Councilor Ralston said once the facility was built as Option 2, people would take different routes anyway.

Councilor Woodrow said that question was brought up in the Citizen Advisory Committee meetings. He noted that traffic counts for both B Street and 4th Street would be provided at the next meeting that would separate public traffic.

Councilor Ballew said whatever traffic was diverted would go into a neighborhood.

Councilor Fitch asked if one of the original options included reversing the block and putting the Jail where the Police Court was and the Police Court on B Street, with stacked parking across the street in the current parking lot. That could close 4th Street, which was less of an issue, but would eliminate the relocation and reduce the 1.8 to 1. This would be similar to Option 4, but keeping it all on the City's existing land with the closure of 4th between A and B Streets. She said it didn't include the improvement of A Street, but B Street could be the entrance.

Councilor Pishioneri noted that the Police, Courts, Jail and secure parking needed to be connected physically, requiring a lot of square footage and adjacent property. He said the only available square footage would be street footage. He discussed the benefit of Option 2 and not having to cross the street. He discussed the diversion of traffic if B Street were closed. Option 2 had less financial impact and better connectivity. Only the alley would have to be moved, which included only a small amount of infrastructure.

Mr. Sherwood reviewed what Councilor Fitch had suggested. He said the fatal flaw in that approach was that there was no direct relationship between the Police/Courts and their secure parking. He said that was one of the key features of all options. He said the Program called for seventy-five secure parking spaces.

Councilor Ballew asked how much secure parking was needed and if the Police had it now.

Chief Smith said currently the City had sixty spaces. He explained the vehicles that used that parking and the need for that number of spaces. He noted that officers were coming and going at all times and were not all there at one time. Other agencies also used the parking when they came to the Police facility. He said what was built today needed to be effective fifty years from now.

Councilor Lundberg asked about functionality.

Mr. Sherwood said they had discussed that with the User Groups.

Ms. Knapel said the function worked for each of the four options, and included the same number of staffing. Options 1 and 2 provided the best connection between the Police/Courts building to the Jail, making it more efficient. Option 2 had the advantage of having the ancillary building adjacent to the Police/Courts building which would have significant impacts on the Police staff. Items stored in the ancillary building would be needed by Police staff. Options 3 and 4 had a hallway connection between those functions making them less efficient. She said the Jail would be designed to have video arraignment, but there would be people held in the Jail that would need to go to trials and other hearings that would need to be transported through those hallways. She addressed the issue of secure parking. Option 1 had secure parking limited to what would fit below building. Option 2 had a better ability to expand the parking in the future. Option 3 also had good flexibility for secure parking. Option 4 had a limited number of secure parking spaces and no opportunity to expand.

Councilor Lundberg said Option 2 was the best option for functionality and had the baseline cost.

Councilor Ralston said there was another possibility. He said he did not want to disrupt the church, but the Carter property was still on the table. He asked what would happen if the City got access to the Carter parking and gave it to the church for their parking. B Street could be left open and at the end of the Police/Courts would be the secure parking. He asked if that could be configured to give enough secure parking. There would still be some employee parking across the street, but B Street could be left open.

Mr. Sherwood reviewed that option. With that option, the entrance to the Court building would be off B Street.

Mr. Golson said that option had not been considered because they had determined that if the Carter property were acquired, it would be used for a building and not parking. He also noted that the ancillary building would be across the street.

Mr. Sherwood said it was that type of hybrid approach of Options 2 and 4 that would be required to keep B Street open.

Mr. Shepard said the cost element would include purchasing the Carter property and demolishing the building which would be about \$70,000 plus the cost of purchasing the property.

Ms. Pappas said staff could give Council a summary of the results of the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) meetings.

Ms. Knapel noted that there were several members and the Chair of the CAC in the audience.

Councilor Ballew suggested using the Booth Kelly site for additional staff parking.

Ms. Knapel said the CAC saw the same presentation that Council was seeing and hosted a Public Forum Open House. They talked with members of the public who looked at the options and received input from the citizens. The CAC reconvened that evening and voted on their preferences. She said there was a tie with half the votes going to Option 2 and half going to Option 4. She said one of the primary issues was trying to save the church and not use the church property. Option 2 gained support because of the functionality issues and secure parking. Those who preferred Option 4 were looking at the development along 5th Street as part of the potential impact of developing downtown Springfield.

Councilor Fitch said she would like to get input from the Washburne neighbors at the next public meeting. She suggested looking at other communities for examples. She said the City needed to be very careful before closing major streets and was not sure there was justification for closing B Street. She said 4th Street could be closed with justification. She had a concern that the project was built within the budget. All questions needed to be considered creatively so there would not be a shortage of funds at the end of the project. She said it was too early to choose an option and staff confirmed that Council did not need to make that choice tonight. She said it had been a good discussion and needed to continue. More citizens would be providing feedback.

Councilor Lundberg said she wanted to see the options without a jail because at this time there was no funding for jail operations. She would like to see which option would be the most viable and the costs.

Councilor Ballew asked why the Public Safety Facility couldn't be placed on the Booth Kelly property since the City already owned it.

Mr. Tamulonis said most of Booth Kelly was unconsolidated fill and would require pilings for most buildings. He said those options were considered ten to fifteen years ago and that type of foundation would raise the cost about twenty to twenty-five percent.

Ms. Pappas noted that leasing the space at Booth Kelly generated funds for the City.

Councilor Ballew said there was room to keep the existing buildings and add the new building.

Councilor Pishioneri discussed the church and said concentration needed to be on the project. He said the church was private property and may not be a church tomorrow. He said it was out of the City's control and could be sold at any time.

Councilor Woodrow said a lot of people on the CAC were from the Washburne District. He said moving the public hearing to February 21 would allow more time to receive input from the neighbors and the citizens in general. He said the options presented by the architects were just options to consider and were not architectural drawings, but site plan potentials. He said it was important to get input from the councilors and citizens to get an idea of what everyone wanted, what was affordable and how we could provide a Police and Jail facility.

Ms. Pappas said staff received a request from the Lane County Justice Court to ask if the Public Safety Facility could accommodate the continued use of some Lane County Justice Court use. She said she wanted Council to consider that request. That issue would be discussed at a future meeting. She said information would be sent in the Communication Packet to address Council's questions.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 1:20 pm.

Minutes Recorder – Amy Sowa

Sidney W. Leiken
Mayor

Attest:

Amy Sowa
City Recorder